

RECEIVED

551023

SEP 27 2001

Howard E Rast <rast@juno.com> on 09/27/2001 09:05:28 PM



To: YMP\_SR@ymp.gov  
cc: rast@juno.com, rsop6@ziplip.com

Subject: COMMENTS ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE STORAGE AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN

Part of Records Package / Supplement / Correction

Dear Friends,

I am a resident of Amargosa Valley, a small rural farming community about 25 miles from the proposed Yucca Mountain radioactive waste storage site. I am strongly opposed to this Project for the following cogent reasons:

1. No study or scientific examination has shown this site to be free from ground water contamination. All the well-drilling "tests" have been severely localized and inadequate in covering the affected region.

2. The geological history of this region shows past volcanic activity and recent evidence of earthquakes.

3. The transportation of such lethal waste is fraught with security and accident deficiencies. I have observed and seen numerous accidents on Highway 127 from Baker to Death Valley Junction and a couple of big rig accidents on the continuation of this highway as Nevada State Highway 373. Each one of these accidents would have strewn containers over a wide region. Whether or not the integrity of the containers would have been breached is a serious question. At the minimum, such accidents would close the highways for days, if not weeks. A recent accident in which an eighteen wheeler overturned near Shoshone is a case in point. The vehicle was transporting innocuous solvents, but the highway was closed for over 27 hours.

4. In light of recent terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, D.C., the proposed security of such transport is totally inadequate. Although armed guards could accompany such transports, I seriously doubt that they would be adequate, sufficiently trained, or adequately armed to preclude hijacking or interception. There is only one California Highway patrolman to cover the area from Baker to the Nevada border at Stateline.

5. Department of Energy has never made a convincing and compelling case for the proposed site. Although the transportation of such waste is the most

immediate  
danger, the long term containment issues are yet to be resolved. DOE has  
evoked  
many arguments and cited many "experts" who are, in fact, not objective  
but are  
beneficiaries of DOE grants and funding.

6. The proposed site is the result of political condemnation. Nevada,  
with its two  
Senators and Representatives was no match for the 54 votes of California  
or other  
population rich states.

I do not want to see Amargosa Valley destroyed by the inevitable decline  
in property  
values, its utility to the state as one of its most fertile valleys, and  
the risk to the  
children and young families who reside here.

Sincerely yours,

H. E. Rast